UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs- Case No. 17-CR-65-WMC

EDMUND J. BRIXEN, Madison, Wisconsin
March 7, 2018
Defendant. 1:09 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
HELD BEFORE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE WILLIAM M. CONLEY

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney
BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
222 West Washington Avenue, Suite 700
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin
BY: PETER R. MOYERS
22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 1000
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also appearing: EDMUND J. BRIXEN, Defendant
RICHARD WILLIAMS, U.S. Probation Officer

Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC
U.S. District Court Federal Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Rm. 410
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 261-5709

(Proceedings called to order at 1:09 p.m.)

THE CLERK: Case No. 17-CR-65, the *United States of America v. Edmund J. Brixen,* called for sentencing.

May we have the appearances, please.

MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United States appears by Elizabeth Altman.

MR. MOYERS: Peters Moyers from Federal Defender Services, and seated here to my left is Mr. Brixen.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, all.

We are here for the sentencing of Edmund Brixen. My first obligation, Mr. Brixen, is to confirm that you've had an opportunity to read and discuss the presentence report and the addendum to that report with your counsel, Mr. Moyers.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The second is to ask the government to confirm its motion for additional one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And also I just want to confirm that the government is withdrawing its objection to the offense level calculation based on a theory of a predicate offense.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Are there any victims or someone here to speak for the victims?

MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. We have been in contact

with the victim's family, and they have opted to have our victim/witness coordinator be here and inform them of what happens.

THE COURT: Very good. And at this point do you anticipate them requesting any restitution?

MS. ALTMAN: They have not indicated that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Based on those preliminaries then, I will accept the plea agreement, finding that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct and the plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing. In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines, and the statutory purposes of sentencing at Section 3553(a) of Title 18 will control.

As to the guidelines, the defendant objected to the use of his conviction for violating Section 948.025(1) as a predicate offense that increases the mandatory minimum and maximum sentences under Section 2251(e) of Title 18. The Court agrees that this is not a predicate offense, as now by withdrawal of the objection does the government, but for somewhat of a different reason than argued by the defendant. A violation of Section 948.025(1) is a divisible statute, and it arises out of a violation of 948.02(1) for first-degree sexual assault or for a violation under Section 948.02(2) for second-degree sexual assault.

The Seventh Circuit addresses the issue of the age mismatch in *U.S. v. Geasland* with respect to first-degree sexual assault. However, in this case there is no documentation that would confirm the defendant committed first-degree sexual assault similar to that in *Geasland*. Therefore, based on the elements required for second-degree sexual assault, the offense may not meet the definition of abusive sexual contact under Section 2244 of Title 18. Specifically, the age of the defendant and the victim at the time of the offense mean the penalties and guideline calculations outlined in the revised presentence report are correct.

Accordingly, I find that the probation office has calculated the guidelines correctly as set forth in the revised presentence report using the current guidelines manual. The calculations do take into account all relevant conduct under Section 1B1.3.

Under grouping rules, the defendant pled guilty to production of child pornography in Count 2 of the indictment and stipulated to the conduct in the remaining counts of the indictment. Conduct for Count 2 as covered by Section 2G2.1 of the guidelines is typically not groupable under Section 3D1.2. However, Counts 1, 2, 3, and 5 were grouped under Group A because they involve the same victim, KV No. 1, and the images charged were created during the same incident rather than a separate occasion or separate harm. Count 5 involves possession

of child pornography that included the images also depicting KV No. 1, and possession of child pornography is a groupable offense. Count 4 is a separate group offense -- we'll call it Group B, as in boy -- because the conduct involves a separate victim, KV No. 2. Total offense level is determined under the multiple-count rule.

Under Group A, the guideline for knowingly and intentionally using a minor to produce sexually explicit visual depictions in violation of Section 2251(a) of Title 18 is found at Section 2G2.1. The defendant caused KV No. 1 to engage in sexually explicit conduct. Therefore, the base offense level is 32 under subsection 2.1(a).

A two-level increase is warranted because KV No. 1 had not yet attained the age of 16 years of age.

A two-level increase is warranted because the defendant engaged in a sexual act with KV No. 1.

Two levels are also added because the defendant used a computer or cell phone to persuade the defendant to engage in sexually explicit conduct and to facilitate the travel of KV No. 1 to engage in sexual conduct as contemplated in subsection 2.1(b)(6)(B). This leaves him with an adjusted offense level for Group A of 38.

Under Group B, the guideline for offenses under Section 2251(a) are found at Section 2G2.1 as well. The defendant caused KV No. 2 to engage in sexually explicit conduct

justifying a base offense level of 32, and two levels are added again because of the use of a computer or cell phone to persuade the defendant to engage in sexually explicit conduct. That leaves him with an adjusted offense level under Group B of 34.

Under the provisions of Section 3D1.2, one unit is assigned to Group A because it is the group with the highest adjusted offense level, and an additional unit is assigned to Group B because it is within four levels of Group A. Those two units result in a two-level offense level increase. Therefore, the defendant's combined offense level is 40.

Additionally, because the offense of conviction is a covered sex crime but since neither Sections 4B1.1 as a career offender nor subsection (a) of Section 4B1.5 applies, the defendant engaged in a pattern of activity involving prohibited sexual conduct and is a repeat and dangerous sex offender against minors. The offense level results in 5 plus the offense level determined under Chapters 2B -- Chapters Two and Three. In this case then, his applicable offense level is 45 under Section 4B1.5(b)(1).

While the defendant qualifies for a three-level downward adjustment under Section 3E1.1 because he pled guilty demonstrating acceptance of responsibility and because of the government's motion for an additional one-level reduction, he still has an offense level of 42 and a criminal history category of IV, meaning that ordinarily he would have an advisory

guideline imprisonment range of 360 months to life. However, the statutory maximum penalty in the present case is 30 years. Therefore, the advisory guideline imprisonment range is 360 months.

That is obviously a lot of time and a very specific sentence as dictated -- or advised, I should say, by the guidelines. I am unable to say, given the severity of the defendant's conduct and his impact on now multiple victims, that it is not within the realm of reason, and, in fact, the government makes a good argument for a sentence of that level. The only mitigating fact I can really find is that -- is the one pointed out in defense counsel's memorandum, which is that until now his longest sentence has been two years, and perhaps there is reason to hope that with proper training and treatment, the defendant will find some way to overcome what is clearly a disturbing history of sexual abuse repeatedly of minor girls, but that hope is offset by the very real risk the defendant represents to that group of the public at this time and by the fact that earlier efforts have proved fruitless with this defendant.

So I am inclined to think that a substantial sentence, if not at 30 years at a very substantial level, is justified, but I have not decided on an appropriate sentence, and I'd be happy to hear any additional comments by counsel, understanding that I have read not only the presentence report but with some care

their written submissions, and, of course, I want to hear from the defendant.

So we'll begin with the government. Ms. Altman.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I will be very brief. I do want to correct one thing in my sentencing memorandum, and that is in the second paragraph I indicated that his guideline range is straight life, and, of course, as the Court just noted, that's incorrect, but it does not change the government's recommendation at all.

The only thing I would like to do at this point is comment on a couple things in the defendant's sentencing memorandum, two things the Court has already touched on. While it's true that he has only spent about five years combined in jail or prison, what he has shown is that it doesn't deter him. He knows the consequences when he's on supervision. If he violates, he's going back to custody and --

THE COURT: The only argument here being that this will be the first time that the book is figuratively thrown at him, and perhaps this will have some greater impact than the earlier marginal sentences that he's faced. It's not much of an argument, but it is an argument.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you. As the Court already noted, he did have the opportunity to go to sex offender treatment. He did not last long in that treatment due to his behavior. The idea that all of these other courts gave him lesser sentences I

don't believe carries much weight. We have no indication what all of those other courts knew about his background, about his history, or anything like that.

And the final thing I would like to say is that addressing this argument that Mr. Brixen isn't the worst of the worst, and I don't know that we've ever seen --

THE COURT: I don't think I want to rise to that. That jumped out at me as well and -- well, if you want to make a comment on it, you may.

MS. ALTMAN: All I would say, Your Honor, is I think it would be hard to find someone who is much worse, someone who is abusing --

THE COURT: I was thinking about that too in response, and the only thing I come up with is overt violence. That's the only thing lacking in the picture of this defendant, so in that sense, I guess that's true, but it's not much of a statement.

MS. ALTMAN: And that's all I have to say, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Moyers, anything else that you'd like to add?

MR. MOYERS: I'd planned to say a lot, but I think the Court hit it right on the head with what the issues are in play here. I think what I would argue is just a point on retribution first, which is it's -- every time anybody reads the presentence reports or even Ms. Altman's sentencing memo, the facts in these cases are always horrible, and they're always stomach churning,

and the reason we have a criminal justice system is because we can't let this feeling of revenge and disgust propel everything, and I'm not saying that that's what would be going on here, but it is something that defense counsel is always trying to raise as an issue for there's a human impulse to over-punish, and I would just highlight that --

THE COURT: And I don't know that it's punishment that's driving the sentence here; it's the risk that the defendant represents to society because he's done this repeatedly despite being jailed and imprisoned, put through programming, and there's no sign that he even appreciates the gravity of the damage that he's doing each time he engages in this conduct.

I'm not disgusted by the defendant. I don't feel revulsion for him. I'm angry, if at all, with our lack of understanding of the behavior and the causes of the behavior, particularly when they start as young as they did with this defendant, but I also have a responsibility to protect the public, which is part of the factors I'm to consider, and that's where I'm just at a loss as to what else can be done other than to incarcerate the defendant for a long period of time.

MR. MOYERS: And I think that's exactly right is that he hasn't gotten a very long sentence yet, and he's going to get one here today, and we don't know -- granted, it isn't the strongest basis we could have for him to make changes, but he's

going to get that long sentence today, and I don't think we can say -- we're just not at the level of certainty yet to say that a sentence of 15 years will do what two years or five years combined hasn't.

And so I guess I would also point out as a final point, Mr. Brixen does have time left in his life. Even if he were to get the statutory maximum, he's still getting out with some life left, and the point -- a message in the sentence should be that change is possible for him, not that the system has just given up and he can't be changed.

Now, I know Mr. Brixen had indicated he wants to read a letter to the Court, if the Court would like to hear it now.

THE COURT: This would be the appropriate time for him to make any statement he cares to make.

THE DEFENDANT: To the courts and judge, thank you for this time. First of all, I'd like to apologize and say sorry to the two girls, Veronica --

MR. MOYERS: Uh-uh.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. -- to the victims I committed my crimes against, also to their families for the mess I put them in and for the hurt and pain I caused them and their families. I hope and pray that they can put this horrible incident behind them and put it in the past. I hope over time the hurt and pain grow smaller.

I know that I'm going to learn from these terrible mistakes

I made. I'm going to do everything in my power to do treatment and therapy, which I believe would help me out in my future to better myself so I don't make these mistakes again. I know these mistakes are not who I am as a person. I made bad choices in life, but I'm going to learn from these bad choices and become a better person for when I eventually get out to the community and become a productive member of society.

To the victims' family and my family, I say again I'm very sorry with all my heart and hope and pray you can forgive me for my mistakes and bad choices I made that affected you all in your lives. I know I need and should be punished for breaking the law criminally and morally and should do time in prison, and I hope that the time I get, that the treatment and therapy can help me become a better person. I think I would like to be able to get out and lead a better life that I know I can lead and be around my family again. Thank you.

THE COURT: It's hard to know where to begin a discussion about your statement or the crimes here because "sorry" obviously just doesn't do it, and to say you hope they can get this horrible incident behind them understates the number of times, particularly as to KV No. 1, the first of the two victims, the number of times that you abused her, and obviously they're not here today, although there will be some report provided to them, and I hope that a sentence today as well as your acknowledgment of your need for treatment will be

of some value to their -- to both victims' recovery.

The difficulty is it's one thing to say that, you know, you're open to treatment, but there's nothing in past history, including past treatment, that suggests you've even taken that seriously in the past, much less that it's had any impact. Can you help me understand as to why you continue to engage in this conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: I think it didn't work before -- when I got the two years before, I was on a list to get treatment, but I didn't have enough time because there was a waiting list, so I didn't have enough time to get into treatment.

THE COURT: You had follow-up opportunities for treatment when you were released.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I was in groups I think it was like once a week -- yeah, I think it was like once a week, and then I'd get revocated and have to go back for a little bit, so I never got to finish that, but I was participating in that, and the group leader actually said I was doing a good job. I just never was able to complete it because I was getting revocated and going back.

THE COURT: Well --

THE DEFENDANT: But the time I got kicked out --

THE COURT: That was going to be my next question. Mr. Moyers anticipated it.

THE DEFENDANT: And then one of the times I got

revocated, they had me do a treatment program in prison, and it was like a 10 or 11-week program, and I was, like, a third of the way through, and somebody said that I was joking around about a CO, which I wasn't.

THE COURT: So the correctional officer made that up?

THE DEFENDANT: From my understanding, it was somebody -- another inmate that said that I said something about another CO.

THE COURT: Except that it was a specific CO, and she certainly didn't come forward and say you didn't make those comments.

THE DEFENDANT: I never made those comments. I was doing good. I was participating --

THE COURT: Do you understand how it's difficult to say you were "doing good" when you were repeatedly revoked for having contact with minor children? I mean, that was part of the program that you were supposed to be following.

THE DEFENDANT: I was doing good in the program --

THE COURT: Instead, you continued to engage in that conduct.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: What doesn't come through is that you really understand what you're doing to other people.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I understand that now. Back then I wasn't in the right mind frame.

THE COURT: And that's what I'm asking: With the number of times people worked with you and tried to get you to change direction, why did it not occur to you -- why were you unable to appreciate the damage you were doing to young girls by engaging in the behavior you did?

THE DEFENDANT: To be honest, I felt that I didn't have a problem. I felt that I was okay and that I didn't need somebody to tell me what to do in life. You know, I was an adult; I can do what I want, and I just -- just didn't care, you know, which is sad to say, but, I mean, I'm just being honest. And now, now that I've had some time, you know, I know I'm not a bad person. I just made some bad choices, and, you know, I got to pay the consequences, and now that I'll actually have time to actually do treatment and therapy, you know, and put all my effort into that, I believe that I can be that, you know, good member of society, you know?

THE COURT: I hope that's how you approach your time in prison.

I am prepared to render sentence. The defendant is now 32 years of age, and he is before this court for his third hands-on sex offense. He appears to have had a difficult early childhood, one of his siblings speculating, given that he was removed from his biological mother by the age of 2, that some of the impacts were irreversible. I don't know that, and I hope that's not true for this defendant. What is true is that it was

determined his biological mother was incapable of caring for him and his siblings, and he was placed in a foster home at approximately the age of 2 where he was eventually adopted by his foster parents when he was about 6 years of age.

The defendant described his foster family in positive terms, indicating they provided for him with unconditional love and support he needed. Indeed, they adopted him and took responsibility for him until the age of 14. Presumably in relation to his first sex offense, but perhaps more broadly because he had become uncontrollable, they returned him to the foster system at their expense.

The defendant's first sex offense occurred around 14 years of age, the same age as one of the minor victims in the current case. The formal facts of that case are unknown, partially because the defendant declined to allow the probation office to examine those records, but his adopted brother indicated that it involved the defendant coercing a younger foster child to perform oral sex on him.

At the age of 19, the defendant was convicted for a second -- his second sex offense for molesting a developmentally disabled student while they were both on a school bus. He received a prison term for that offense and was released at the age of 22.

Over the next four years, his extended supervision was revoked four different times. Many of his violations included

inappropriate contact and interactions with minor females. Intermediate sanctions such as institution placements for sex offender programming has resulted in no discernible improvement in the defendant's behavior. Indeed, he was discharged from programming at Racine Correctional Institution after expressing a desire to tie up a female correctional officer, although he denies that occurred.

In addition, two maternal siblings and the defendant's adopted brother were contacted for the presentence report, who expressed frustration that the defendant has not taken advantage of past programming provided to him as well as the general belief that the defendant poses too great a danger not to incarcerate him for as long as possible. I'm not sure for any sentence of the gravity of this one that we've been in a situation where no one has stepped forward to speak on behalf of the defendant or at least write a letter of support, and it is a disturbing fact that that is true here.

As for the crime of conviction, the defendant arranged to meet with a 14-year-old girl at a grocery store in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Communicating with an undercover officer posing as that 14-year-old, the defendant agreed to take the child shopping for bras and panties. Upon contact with investigators, the defendant's phone was seized. A subsequent review of his phone revealed the defendant exchanged messages and images with two minor females. The text messages between these victims and

the defendant were graphic and sexual in nature. The images included naked pictures of both victims and the defendant.

As to Victim No. 2, fortunately, she never met with the defendant, but Victim No. 1 did. In fact, the defendant traveled to Minnesota on four occasions to meet with her. On three occasions she performed oral sex on the defendant at a local park. In her statement to investigators, she described her reluctance to do so but felt the defendant would become angry if she refused. On the fourth occasion, the defendant picked the victim up and brought her to his trailer in northern Wisconsin where he was living. The defendant took a number of pictures of himself and the victim engaged in sexual conduct while at his residence, which he saved on his phone.

Given the defendant's crimes, he certainly fits the sometimes overused description of a sexual predator, and he continues to pose a significant danger to the community, particularly to underage girls. At the age of 32 and with repeated interventions, no meaningful improvement has occurred, and except for the fact that the defendant's longest previous sentence was two years, which I am considering under Section 5K2.0, there are no mitigating factors to warrant a departure from the guideline range. To the contrary, the guidelines at Section 4A1.3(b)(2) would prohibit a downward departure for a repeat dangerous sex offender.

If anything, the defendant's history and characteristics

and the likelihood that he will commit additional offenses would justify an upward departure but for the statutory maximum sentence, which capped the guideline range. Still, I do find that for the reasons stated by the defense and the hope that meaningful treatment may impact the defendant, that some departure is appropriate. This is now the defendant's third sex offense conviction in addition to past violations of supervision involving contact with minors. He has had numerous interventions that have produced no marked improvement in his predatory behavior, and for that reason I nevertheless find a substantial sentence that would incarcerate the defendant into his late 50s is necessary to protect the community and achieve the statutory purposes of Section 3553(a) and (b)(2) of Title 18. Hopefully it will result in the defendant confronting the behaviors that put him here before me today.

Taking into consideration the nature of the offense as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a custodial sentence of 25 years is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs, and achieve parity with sentences of similarly situated offenders.

As to Count 2 of the indictment, it is adjudged that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 300 months. I strongly recommend that the

defendant be placed in an appropriate facility capable of completing a full mental health assessment and then providing extensive sex offender treatment. I also recommend that the defendant be afforded prerelease placement in a residential re-entry center with work release privileges. For the reasons I have already noted, the defendant's term of imprisonment is to be followed by a lifetime term of supervised release. In light of the nature of the offense and the defendant's personal history, I adopt Condition Nos. 1 through 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11 through 20 as proposed and justified in the presentence report. I note that neither party raised any objections to those conditions.

Further, the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 makes clear that the primary goals of supervised release are to assist defendant's transition into the community after a term of imprisonment and to provide for rehabilitation. The imposed conditions here are warranted based on the defendant's offense of conviction involving both the production of child pornography and stipulated conduct involving the possession of pornography.

Even more troubling is the defendant's longer term pattern of communications with, grooming of, and sexual molestation of minors. Accordingly, monitoring IT equipment and his activities generally will be crucial to ensuring the defendant does not possess illegal materials or solicit images of minors, ensuring the safety of minors, monitoring his travel and sex registration

requirements, and confirming his compliance with treatment. The financial monitoring condition is also appropriate because the defendant may be required to contribute to treatment costs, and it will allow the probation officer the ability to monitor the defendant's purchases, particularly of computer-related equipment and internet service providers.

There is some question, nevertheless, whether this court should state each of the conditions verbatim on the record and justify them individually, which I am happy to do, unless the defense wishes to waive my doing so.

MR. MOYERS: We would waive that reading today.

THE COURT: I do adopt verbatim the conditions noted as well as the individual justifications for those conditions along with the explanation I believe is ample and already in the record today. If either the defendant or the supervising probation officer believes any of these conditions imposed today are no longer appropriate when the defendant is released from confinement to begin his term of supervised release, either one and preferably both jointly may petition the Court for review, and I would certainly consider or the judge who was here at the time will consider modifications as appropriate. Hopefully by that time neurology will catch up with our lack of understanding of these crimes and the reasons for them and there will be some better conditions that can address the defendant's ongoing behaviors.

The instant offense is not drug related, and the defendant has no history of drug use. Therefore, the requirements for drug testing set forth at Section 3583(d) of Title 18 is waived.

It is adjudged the defendant is to pay a $100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin immediately following sentencing.

The defendant is to pay mandatory restitution to the U.S. Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, but at this time neither of the victims have requested restitution. Unless they request a hearing, we will leave it at that.

The defendant has a negative net worth and qualified for court-appointed counsel. Therefore, the $5,000 assessment under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 is waived, as it appears he does not have the means to pay that assessment.

He also does not have the means to pay any further fine under Section 5E1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release from custody. However, a final order of forfeiture of property already seized is granted under Section 2253(a) of Title 18.

The probation office is to notify local law enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of the defendant's release back to the community.

I believe the government has a motion with respect to the remaining counts of the indictment.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I would move to dismiss

the remaining counts.

THE COURT: And I do dismiss all remaining counts against this defendant.

My final obligation, Mr. Brixen, is to advise you that you have every right to file a notice of appeal, and you have very capable counsel who can advise you of potential grounds to appeal, but you only have 14 days to file it, so that's a discussion you should have as soon as possible with your counsel if you wish to do so.

This is a very long sentence, and it is because of the nature of the conduct and because of sentences that have been entered against many similarly situated and, frankly, because of the substantial risk you pose to young girls in our community until you get a better handle on your own predispositions and apparent inability to really appreciate the damage you're causing not just to either of these victims based on a single horrible incident but based on that traveling with them for the rest of their lives.

There's no evidence in the record that you yourself were molested, and it's hard to understand how you fell as far as you did and treated other people as objects. As I said before, I wish we had a better understanding of that. I hope you will spend the time, admittedly a long time, reflecting on why that is and becoming the person you say you want to be. I would encourage you to be open to the treatment that you'll be

provided, to spend time with others who are truly trying to change the focus of their lives and not with those who within the federal system are marking time until they can go out and victimize others.

If you do that and you start to develop other goals and interests, you still could make a contribution to society and perhaps even mend some of the fences with your family. If you don't, supervision is a serious process. They will work with you on your release. The probation office's goal is to see you succeed on release, but as you've seen in the past, they will also hold you accountable and are required to report violations to this court.

It's hard to know in these situations other than the general information we have about sexual predators, who tend to be fairly bright individuals with the ability to manipulate others, particularly those who are vulnerable. You have to get beyond that to some sense of actual empathy, and if you do that, there is hope for all of us, and you could be part of the solution to what has probably always been a tremendous problem but has surfaced in ways that it hadn't before because of the internet. Society could use people like that, and I hope you are able to make a contribution in that area at the end of your sentence, perhaps even during your sentence if you make the right steps.

Anything more for the government?

MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything more for the defense?

MR. MOYERS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

THE CLERK: This Honorable Court is adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 1:53 p.m.)

***

I, JENNIFER L. DOBBRATZ, Certified Realtime and Merit Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held on the 7th day of March, 2018, before the Honorable William M. Conley, U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time and place.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2018.

/s/ Jennifer L. Dobbratz

Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC
Federal Court Reporter

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.